

June 7, 1965

Decent homes in decent surroundings and a chance to learn are a part of the answer. Welfare and social programs better designed to hold families together are part of the answer.

Care for the sick is part of the answer. An understanding heart by all Americans is also part of the answer.

To all these fronts—and a dozen more—I will dedicate the expanding efforts of my administration.

TO CALL CONFERENCE

But there are other answers still to be found. Nor do we fully understand all the problems. Therefore, this fall, I intend to call a White House conference of scholars, experts, Negro leaders, and officials at every level of government.

Its theme and title: "To Fulfill These Rights."

Its object: To help the American Negro to fulfill the rights which—after the long time of injustice—he is finally about to secure.

To move beyond opportunity to achievement.

To shatter forever, not only the barriers of law and public practice, but the walls which bound the condition of man by the color of his skin.

To dissolve, as best we can, the antique enmities of the heart which diminish the holder, divide the great democracy, and do wrong to the children of God.

I pledge this will be a chief goal of my administration and of my program next year, and in years to come.

I hope it will be part of the program of all America.

For what is justice?

It is to fulfill the fair expectations of man.

Thus, American justice is a very special thing. For, from the first, this has been a land of towering expectations. It was to be a nation where each man would be ruled by the common consent of all—enshrined in law, given life by institutions, guided by men themselves subject to its rule. And all—of every station and origin—would be touched equally in obligation and in liberty.

Beyond the law lay the land. It was a rich land, glowing with more abundant promise than ever man had seen. Here, unlike any place yet known, all were to share the harvest.

And beyond this was the dignity of man. Each could become whatever his qualities of mind and spirit would permit—to strive, to seek, and, if he could, to find his happiness.

This is American justice. We have pursued it faithfully to the edge of our imperfections. And we have failed to find it for the American Negro.

It is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American Nation—and in so doing to find his happiness.

This is American justice. We have pursued it faithfully to the edge of our imperfections. And we have failed to find it for the American Negro.

It is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American Nation—and in so doing to find America for ourselves, with the same immense thrill of discovery which gripped those who first began to realize that here, at last, was a home for freedom.

All it will take is for all of us to understand what this country is and what it must become.

The Scripture promises: "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart, which shall not be put out."

Together, and with millions more, we can light that candle of understanding in the heart of America.

And, once lit, it will never again go out.

CEREMONIES MEMORIALIZING THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly privileged on Memorial Day last to have participated in ceremonies dedicating a plaque memorializing the late President Kennedy in Paris, Mo.

It was truly an inspiring ceremony. The distinguished citizens of this vicinity made of the moment a rite of solemn rededication to those noble ideals which the late President so personified in his life.

The climax of the ceremonies was a moving and brilliant address by the Honorable WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, our colleague from the Ninth District of Missouri.

I know that Members of this body would be greatly interested in the text of his address and I therefore, under unanimous consent, insert them at this point in the Record:

THE GENIUS OF JOHN F. KENNEDY: STATEMENT FOR DELIVERY AT THE DEDICATION OF A KENNEDY MEMORIAL PLAQUE IN PARIS, MO., MAY 30, 1965

Senator Vanlandingham, Representative Southern, Dr.-Mayor Barnett, distinguished Judges, my colleague Congresswoman MINK of Hawaii, reverend clergy, and friends, we are citizens of a nation marching to greatness with the lock step of destiny. Political and personal courage has been ours, in the face of fearsome obstacles, powerful enemies, and seemingly impossible odds. Political and personal statesmanship also has been ours; not always, but certainly when it was most needed, to see us through some terrible domestic or international crises—crises calculated to cut us down and drive us from the road to glory and success.

Nor can we ourselves—we, the American people—claim exclusive credit for all we have achieved as a nation. For seemingly we are gifted with the greatest fortune in several areas: outstanding natural resources for one, geographical advantages for another, and, most important, an almost mystical ability to correctly determine, in time of crisis, the potential ability of our political leaders, and to select our best and most able citizens to lead us from the jaws of catastrophe to the haven of victory and accomplishment.

So it was when, in November 1960, the American people elected to the Presidency the late John F. Kennedy, a man both wise and imaginative, sensitive and strong, knowledgeable in the area of economic needs and human rights, capable in both the diplomatic arts of persuasion and compulsion.

When John F. Kennedy first appeared upon the scene, as our newly elected President, there was much that needed doing in America and throughout the world. Domestically, a kind of stagnation had begun to settle in upon us. With a population increasing in size, a mile a minute, we seemed to be producing now new jobs—or so few that the national economy was clearly in danger of losing step with the demands of the moment. With a country crying out for learning, we had no significant national program in effect looking to the improvement of our educational facilities. With an ever-increasing army of senior citizens present in our midst, we as a people had made no move to care for and attend to the medical needs

of this large and important segment of the national community. With a Federal Constitution setting forth the demand for absolute equality in the area of American voting rights and other major areas, there seemed no strong executive hand at the wheel, to enforce the Federal will, so far as these vital matters were concerned.

The appearance of John F. Kennedy changed all this, to the distinct advantage of the Nation at large. During his abbreviated term in office, a new era began. It can be called an era of reform, combined with a determined effort, in the field of international politics, to alter our former national stance, in the interest of both peace and forceful determination; to place ourselves on the line, solidly against the further extension of Communist slavery, yet also to preserve and encourage open communication between ourselves and the Communist leaders of the world, in the interest of universal peace.

President Kennedy's years in office will always be marked with distinction, above all, for his handling of the Cuban crisis of 1962. It was then that he took the supreme risk, telling the American people—and, indeed, the people of the entire free world—what had to be faced, and thereupon proceeded to block the course of the Soviet convoy carrying medium-range rockets to sites in Cuba. By so doing he prevented a severe alteration of the international balance of power, and at the same moment made clear the American spirit, in the eyes of the world.

John F. Kennedy was the youngest man ever to be elected to the Presidency. He was also the first President born in the 20th century and the first Roman Catholic; the first of purely Irish descent. Yet all of this is mere window dressing, in the historical sense, for the main fact of the matter is that he accomplished what few before him have been able to accomplish.

It often is observed that an American President can be effective abroad or effective at home—but not both. The range of subjects with which a President must deal renders it difficult in the extreme for him to follow through problems simultaneously as a foreign minister and as a politician.

And yet the record of John F. Kennedy reveals his genius in this very regard. In the area of foreign relations he played a mighty hand: Driving the missiles out of Cuba, bolstering our world position, yet working constantly for a kind of rapprochement with the Soviet Union, in behalf of international accord.

At the same time, domestically, he launched a program with the object of placing education, the ballot box, and medical care within reach of every American citizen, social, racial, and economic considerations notwithstanding.

It is ironic that during the period that John F. Kennedy was in office, Congress was not receptive to his domestic program, yet no sooner was he gone than the mood of Congress softened, and feature after feature of his New Frontier design was enacted into law, without difficulty.

So far as domestic politics are concerned, however, John F. Kennedy will be remembered as a brave and noble warrior in many major battles. It was he who forced the question of education upon the attention of national legislators who wanted to pretend it was some kind of local matter. It was he who worked for medical care—genuine medical care—for the aged, under social security. It was he who rushed to battle—out in the open, without qualification, repeatedly—in behalf of the spirit of civil rights, as well as the mere letter of the law.

As a naval officer and a native son of Massachusetts, President Kennedy well understood the importance of our water resources. He recognized that our Nation could ill afford and need not afford disastrous floods which wreak havoc to our cities and lay waste to our farmlands. President Kennedy knew the power of these streams could be preserved for productive uses. He recognized the constantly increasing power needs of an expanding and dynamic economy and knew that development of water resources could provide the necessary energy to tame the wheels of progress. President Kennedy foresaw that a Nation with constantly increasing leisure time must have additional recreational facilities, another byproduct of the appropriate development of our water resources. He saw the inherent danger in pollution of the air we breathe and the water we drink, and he was the champion of causes similar to those now crying out for development of such dams in our State as the Joanna or Cannon, and such basins as the Meramec, Chariton, and Grand River.

As a staunch supporter and a great admirer of John F. Kennedy, during his service as President of the United States, I take the greatest pride in participating in this event—the dedication of a Kennedy Memorial plaque, to stand forever as a symbol of respect to a man who lived, and worked, and died, fighting for the democratic principles in which he so deeply believed.

I thank you for your attention.

(Mr. POAGE (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. POAGE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the Committee on Ways and Means will bring up tomorrow, under unanimous consent, three bills reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. They are H.R. 4493, to continue until the close of June 30, 1966, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap; H.R. 5768, to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk; and H.R. 7621, to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit button blanks to crude forms suitable for manufacture into buttons.

WATER AND TEETH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Woonsocket Call recently commented editorially on the problem of dental caries, a disease suffered by 95 percent of the American people, and on the use of water fluoridation to eliminate this needless dental decay.

The editorial discusses the fact that 67 million Americans today are drinking

fluoridated water, and within the next few months it will be made available to an additional 10.5 or 11 million persons. Both New York City with some 8 million inhabitants and Detroit with another 2.5 million will insure better dental health for their residents by following the lead of other farsighted cities in adopting community water fluoridation. The editorial also points out that, contrary to rumor, there have been no reports of any major disaster occurring anywhere from excess fluoridation.

The U.S. Public Health Service, charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the Nation's health, has since 1952 urged people of this country to take advantage of the proven effectiveness of water fluoridation in reducing dental decay. Certain individuals, a vociferous minority, have closed their eyes to the facts and have worked in opposition to this progressive measure. However, virtually every reputable scientific organization in this and other countries has approved and endorsed fluoridation of public water supplies. I am proud to report that in the State of Rhode Island, 88 percent of the population drinks fluoridated water.

I hope that in the near future all of the citizens of our Great Society can enjoy the benefits of this public health measure.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Woonsocket, R.I., Call and Evening Reporter on April 28. It is a tribute to this fine newspaper's sense of public responsibility. This editorial is fair and objective and leaves little doubt in the reader's mind of the facts about fluoridation. I, therefore, include the editorial verbatim in the RECORD:

WATER AND TEETH

As little explosive pockets of opinion about water fluoridation get into the news on occasion, a trend is quietly developing, it seems, so that the latest figures from Washington show some 67 million consumers of such water, including us in Woonsocket.

In other words, approximately one-third of the Nation is drinking water either artificially treated with fluorides, or water that is natural in this element. Dr. Donald J. Galagan, an assistant surgeon general with the U.S. Public Health Service, and chief of its division on dental public health and resources, said that within a few months, "an additional 10.5 to 11 million persons will be drinking artificially fluoridated water." About 7 million citizens already drink wet stuff that is by nature fluoridated, he noted.

It is something of a major decision to treat local water supplies, some medical and other authorities being opposed to it, supposedly on the ground that fluorides are poisonous in certain doses. So, too, is aspirin, it may be said.

Another factor is cost. A small municipality, for example, needs special equipment and a man to supervise its operation, so that only correctly apportioned amounts enter supply lines for any given volume of water.

Even so, we have received no reports of any major disaster occurring anywhere through excessive fluoridation. Indeed, perhaps water tastes bad when overdosed, thus carrying its own built-in protection.

When New York and Detroit commence plans for fluoridation, millions of persons will be involved, some 8 million of them in New York City alone, and 2.5 million in Detroit. Presumably, some thought has been given the project by these cities planners.

The trend toward water fluoridation as a means of avoiding dental decay has been steady, according to Dr. Galagan, ever since initiation of the process in 1945. Strangely enough, proposals to fluoridate more often lose than win when put to popular vote.

To vote on fluoridation seems to be the democratic way, provided both sides are permitted to present their cases. It is worth reflecting, however, that there are 2,792 communities with fluoridation, and that the community increase in 1962, 1963, and last year, was 124, 236, and 180, respectively.

THE VIETNAM ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no news and no exaggeration to say that the most critical problem confronting this country today is the crisis in Vietnam. It is also one of the most complex issues of our time; an issue which defies the quick and easy "answers" of withdrawal or total escalation which offer no real solution at all.

One of the most thoughtful and persuasive statements on this subject was made 2 weeks ago by the very able and distinguished professor of political science at the University of California, Dr. Robert Scalapino. Professor Scalapino is chairman of the department of political science on the university's Berkeley campus, and is one of the most knowledgeable men in the entire country on the problems of southeast Asia. His comments, therefore, deserve close attention and consideration.

Professor Scalapino has made a number of important points, a few of which I would like to emphasize briefly.

The National Liberation Front, he has stressed, is a movement directed and controlled in all of its important aspects by Communists outside of Vietnam. Is it not revealing, he has asked, that almost none of the top Buddhist, Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, Catholic, or Dai Viet leaders have joined this supposed "patriotic front"?

An impressive aspect of the Vietcong's organization, he reminds us, involves coercion. Since 1959, Dr. Scalapino points out, Vietcong terrorists, operating under orders from Hanoi, have killed between 6,000 and 10,000 village and district leaders. In the first 4 months of this year alone more than 260 were liquidated, some in the most horrible fashion. Is it any wonder that progress on the local community level has been halting and slow?

The political instability of the national government in Saigon continues to constitute a grave threat, Mr. Scalapino makes clear. The task of nation building in this area of the world, with its many diverse ethnic and religious groups, is certain to be long and difficult at best. But, he emphasizes, none of these groups wants to come under Communist dominance, which is, of course, the objective of Hanoi and Peiping.

There is criticism of our Vietnam policy in Asia and in this country. With the possible exception of Indonesia, however, not a single non-Communist government wants the American presence

June 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12211

withdrawn. To allow the Chinese, Professor Scalapino has stated, to establish their hegemony over Asia either directly or through trusted followers, would be to desert the force of Asian nationalism, not support it.

Nor will withdrawal under pressure produce peace. To do so would merely set the stage for further surrenders, and ultimate global war.

What then, Professor Scalapino asks, should our policy be? In his two-point response he offers, I believe, a sound basis for our policy.

Let us keep open, he suggests, two broad channels with respect to the entire Communist world. Let one channel involve our willingness to engaged in the broadest cultural relations, the fullest trade and the most extensive interactions. Let us state specifically that we are willing to remove American military forces from all of southeast Asia as soon as some international guarantees and international force can be established so that neutrality and independence in this region can be secured. Let us embark directly upon the giant task of economic development which President Johnson has sketched, and let us indicate our willingness to participate with all nations who are willing and able to help.

The second channel is headed by a warning to the Communist leaders of the north that the use of force will be met by force. If there is to be any chance of peace in our time, we must make clear that we are not paper tigers.

Fundamentally, Professor Scalapino has concluded, our policy must be one designed to encourage moderation and discourage extremism on the part of our opponents, and one that seeks now to start closing the gap between the haves and the have-nots of this world.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Professor Scalapino's excellent and timely address, which I include in its entirety, to our colleagues for their attention:

THE VIETNAM ISSUE (By Robert A. Scalapino)

The Vietnam crisis is one of the most complex and serious crises to have confronted the United States since World War II. Nothing which I say here is intended to imply that there are any easy solutions, or that the facts are unambiguous. Yet, on balance, the evidence, in my opinion, supports the main thrust of our present policy while suggesting also certain improvements. Either withdrawal or total escalation would represent far graver risks.

What are the most essential facts? Let us turn first to the situation in South Vietnam. The Communists, as you know, insist that the National Liberation Front must be recognized as the only legitimate representative of the South Vietnamese people. They assert that it is an indigenous, nationalist force having the support of a majority of the people. Each of these assertions is, on balance, either false or misleading.

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT

The so-called National Liberation Front of South Vietnam is, and always has been, an instrument of the North Vietnamese Communist Party. It has made use of indigenous grievances to acquire support and in earlier times at least, its rank and file came mainly

from southern peasant lads, persuaded or coerced into service, but its most dynamic elements have always been external.

The Vietcong, in fact, is a carbon copy of the Vietminh which earlier secured the north for the Communists, and which, in turn, borrowed heavily from the organizational tactics of the Chinese Communists. Hanoi serves as its headquarters. Differences over immediate tactics may indeed have existed between the VC and Hanoi from time to time. But there have never been any significant differences in basic policies or programs, as anyone who has studied this movement knows well.

If there is any doubt on this question, listen to the words of Peiping, uttered only 1 month ago. The Vietnamese struggle for national liberation against the United States, said Peiping, was certain to win because it was under "the wise leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Workers' Party of Vietnam." The leaders of Hanoi have been saying the same thing repeatedly for at least 5 years.

This, then, is a movement directed and controlled in all of its important aspects not only by Communists, but by Communists outside South Vietnam. The real nationalist leaders of South Vietnam know these facts very well. That is why they have refused to join the Vietcong, despite serious disagreements among themselves. Is it not revealing that almost none of the top Buddhist, Cao Dai, Hoa Eao, Catholic, or Dai Viet leaders have joined this supposed "patriotic front"? Is it not significant that the Vietcong leaders are all nameless, faceless men, leaders unknown to their own people? And is this not some evidence that we are not fighting against nationalism in Vietnam, but rather attempting to support genuine nationalists who do not wish to fall under Communist rule?

THE VIETCONG

But what of the people? Do they support communism in spite of the opposition of their leaders? The Communists assert that the Vietcong control some two-thirds of the south, and have the support of a great majority of the South Vietnamese people. Once again, these so-called facts are either false or misleading. It is true that the Vietcong control a large part of South Vietnam either wholly or partially—perhaps 60 percent of the territory. It is also true that they have support—in various forms—of the people in this territory, and from some people not in Vietcong areas as well.

There are three significant points to be made, however, which are often overlooked by those who insist that the people support the Vietcong, or that if the Vietnamese want communism, they should be allowed to have it. First, the Vietcong at this stage is not posing to the peasant the issue of communism versus an open system. On the contrary, Vietcong propaganda carefully hides the true nature of the leadership of this movement and its long-range goals. Typically, VC literature plays upon purely local grievances, or "bourgeois democratic" themes such as religious freedom, political rights, and land reform. Considerable support in some areas has been garnered as a result of these campaigns. However, this is not support for communism, and events in the north have shown so tragically how this cycle can be played out.

The northern peasants also were promised land reform, religious freedom, and political rights. But after the Vietminh came to full power in 1954, they got communism, and in 1956, when the northern regime imposed land collectivization, a full-scale revolt occurred in which thousands of peasants were killed.

But fraud is not the only basis for Viet-

cong power. Organization is probably a more significant factor. The Vietcong, patterned after all other Communist movements, has developed great organizational skill, and it operates in a society where, generally speaking, the organizational units are weak and disconnected. Anyone familiar with American big city politics knows that organization is often more important than issues, and not necessarily connected with them.

TERROR

And an impressive aspect of Vietcong organization involves coercion. Since Hanoi gave the orders for guerrilla warfare in 1959, Vietcong terrorists have killed between 6,000 and 10,000 village and district leaders according to reliable estimates. What government could easily maintain stability or engage in reform under such conditions? In the first 4 months of this year alone, more than 260 local leaders have been liquidated, some of them in the most horrible fashion. Terror has been used, to be sure, by both sides, but the systematic terror of the Vietcong has involved an attempt to wipe out all political authority except their own at the all-important local and district levels. Some of these local leaders were, no doubt, bad, others indifferent, some good—but the only issue in any case was whether they supported the government.

If the Vietcong were truly so popular, would this massive terrorism be necessary? In my own field research, I became convinced that only a small percentage of the South Vietnamese had a firm political commitment to the Vietcong, although the percentage committed to the government was not much higher. But the great majority of people were primarily concerned with the problem of survival for themselves and their families. In this sense, the problem of the Vietcong is a military problem—as was the problem of the Malayan terrorists—a problem of being able to provide security so that people can live, work and think without fear.

POLITICAL INSTABILITY

The political instability of the National Government in Saigon continues to constitute a grave threat. In part, of course, this is a product of the degree of freedom which exists in the south despite the war. The task of nation building in this area is certain to be long and difficult especially if any degree of freedom accompanies it, as a result of the diverse ethnic and religious groups composing the society. It would be wise to reemphasize that none of these groups want to come under Communist dominance. The Vietcong can always collect 3 Catholics, 5 Cao Dai, and 10 Buddhists, but it cannot represent the mainstreams. Indeed, the powerful Buddhist movement continues to stand committed to a truly neutralist solution with the Vietcong going north, and the American forces going out, a solution which may be unrealistic but which certainly would not be against our objectives if it could be effected.

NORTH VIETNAM

What are the most vital facts concerning the north? The evidence suggests that despite certain gains in 1962-63, economic conditions there are not good. The party organs themselves admit that some of the younger generation thinks too much about material gains, and not enough about sacrifices for the fatherland. "Get Out of South Vietnam" buttons could not be distributed in Hanoi. More importantly, perhaps, have been the radical changes which took place in the Lao Dong Party of North Vietnam beginning in late 1962. At that time, the younger, militant pro-Chinese elements captured control of the central committee, and they have been in control up to date.

We know some of the arguments that took place, and we can guess others. One critical issue was, Should the war in the south be escalated or not? The militants argued that it should, and, following the Chinese line, deprecated the risks of heavier American involvement. They too argued that we were paper tigers. Increased North Vietnamese involvement in the southern war is directly connected with this major political change in the north. Since early 1963, the alliance between Peiping and Hanoi has been exceedingly close, and both parties have pursued a totally militant line.

POLICY ALTERNATIVES

How do these facts affect the alternatives of policy confronting us? Let us look first at the arguments favoring withdrawal. Some say that if we were to allow the Communists to take all of Vietnam, Ho would become another Tito, and help in the containment of China. I regard this argument as very dubious. In the first place, Ho himself is 75 years of age, in indifferent health, and, whatever his personal views, not likely to be active for long. As just noted, the rising Communist leaders of the north are the young pro-Chinese elements, and men like Truong Chinh, whose name—Long March—signifies his allegiance. It should be remembered that if Vietnam has a long history of struggle against Chinese domination, it has an equally long history of accommodation to Chinese power. More important, Titoism was a product of a true balance of power and of certain historical circumstances. Tito quite literally exists between East and West; no such balance of power will exist in southeast Asia if we withdraw. Nor are the Vietnamese interests as limited as those of Tito. Hanoi claims control over the Communist movements of this entire region and if it is victorious in South Vietnam, it will certainly exercise its claim in Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, at least.

The great argument for withdrawal is that it will prevent war, and in some measure, put us into harmony with the force of Asian nationalism. Let me discuss the second argument first. Of course there is criticism of our Vietnam policy in Asia, as there is in America. It is simply not true, however, to imply that the non-Communist leaders of Asia want us to withdraw from the Asian area. With the possible exception of Indonesia, not a single non-Communist government of this region wants the American presence to disappear. Privately, this has been made clear to many of us. Why would they want American influence in Asia to be destroyed? They know that in Asia, if there is to be a balance of power, it must involve the United States at present. Did not India call upon us as well as the Russians for aid when attacked by China? Have not the neutralists Souphannaphouma and Kong Le found in us their only hope against the Communists in Laos? Are not Tungku Abdul Rahman and Lee Kuan Yew in Malaysia dependent in the final analysis upon us as well as the British if they are to avoid being destroyed? And these men are not reactionaries. They are social democrats and nationalists—all of them.

To allow the Chinese to establish their hegemony over Asia either directly or through their trusted followers, will be to desert the force of Asian nationalism, not to support it. If any proof is needed, look at the tributary status which Cambodia has had to accept, and look at the mounting pressures upon other small states like Burma and Nepal. We face a real challenge, and one not completely met, of working more closely with non-Communist Asians on political and military matters, but we can-

not meet that challenge by reverting to isolation.

WITHDRAWAL WILL NOT PRODUCE PEACE

Nor will withdrawal produce peace. On the contrary, it will go a long distance toward making world war III inevitable. The Peiping thesis concerning the United States is well known but let me summarize it: American imperialism is a paper tiger. If challenged firmly, it will retreat. People are more important than weapons, and by launching people's wars, we can destroy the United States and its lackies. The Russians, on the other hand, by appeasing America and seeking peaceful coexistence with her are undermining the revolutionary forces of the world.

If we prove this Peiping thesis correct by withdrawing from Vietnam under pressure, we will have merely set the stage for further surrenders, and ultimate global war. Only a month ago, Peiping launched the Thai patriotic front with great fanfare. A leading Government spokesman proclaimed that the Chinese people would support the Thai in their liberation struggle, and asserted that they looked upon such support as our glorious international duty. Some individuals will shortly tell us that this movement also is an indigenous, nationalist movement that springs out of the yearnings of the Thai.

The domino theory is not adequate to explain the problem. The state after Thailand may be Venezuela not Burma. The game is checkers, not dominos, but it is a deadly game, and old notions about geographic spheres of influence—you take Asia, we will take the Western Hemisphere—as advanced by Lippmann and others have little relation to the modern world.

COMMUNIST REJECTION OF COMPROMISE

What, then, should our policy be? In Asia, a militant power is emerging. Note carefully that Communist China not only rejects all notion of compromise with us at the moment, she also rejects all compromise with her two other enemies, the Soviet Union and India. A few months ago, it was legitimate perhaps to believe that Peiping and her ally might be willing to negotiate with us on terms short of unconditional surrender. But note what has happened. Peiping described the proposals of the 17 nonaligned nations as a plot concocted by Tito; labeled the Indian proposal for an Afro-Asian international force in Vietnam to patrol the boundary as "ridiculous," told U Thant not to come to Peiping, rejected all British, French, and Canadian private overtures; forced Sihanouk to sabotage completely the Cambodian Conference, and denounced our cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam for 5 days as "a dirty trick."

The burden of proof is certainly upon those who seriously believe that Peiping and Hanoi are willing to settle the Vietnam crisis peacefully except on their own terms; namely, the total withdrawal of American troops and aid from the South; the recognition of the National Liberation Front as the only legitimate representative of the South Vietnamese people, and the rapid unification of the country under the Lao Bong Party.

We cannot and should not accept those conditions, nor should we engage in any trick of having the French or Russians accept them for us. The Vietcong should be allowed to participate in any negotiations but as Communists, whether a part of, or a part from Hanoi, and all other South Vietnamese groups should be given full representation.

As I have stated, Peiping is also demanding unconditional surrender from the Russians. To improve Sino-Soviet relations, she recently asserted, the Soviet leaders must totally repudiate Khrushchev and all of his

acts, and apologize to the Communist world for the Soviet policies of the past decade. It is not surprising that the Russians have rejected these terms, and that the Indians have rejected the terms of settlement proposed for the border crisis. I cannot understand the logic of those who feel that we would preserve world peace by being the first major power to capitulate to Peiping.

POLICY PROPOSAL

Rather, I would propose this policy: Let us keep open two broad channels with respect to the entire Communist world. Let one of those channels lead to peaceful coexistence, and involve our willingness to engage in the broadest cultural relations, the fullest trade, and extensive interaction with all in the major international organizations and discussions of our time. Let us make it clear to China as well as to others that we do indeed want to live and let live. And let us state specifically that we are willing to remove American military forces from all of southeast Asia as soon as some international guarantees and international force can be established so that the true neutrality and independence of this region can be secured. Let us seek to support the development of Finlands, not Bulgarias in Asia. What could be more in accordance with true Asian nationalism than this, and more moral?

Let us also embark immediately upon the giant task of economic development which President Johnson recently sketched in concert with other societies, and once again, let us indicate our willingness to participate with all nations who are willing and able to help.

But the other channel must also be clearly marked and adequately maintained. This second channel is headed by the warning that if the Communists of Hanoi or Peiping, or anyone else insist upon using force to settle disputes upon their own terms, they will be met by force. If there is to be any chance of peace in our times, we must make it clear that we are not paper tigers.

Our present policy, on balance, is an attempt to avoid the extremes. No one can guarantee its success. Perhaps its primary weakness is that it runs counter to American psychology in some degree. We are an impatient people, who tend to want quick and efficient answers—thus to many, it should be "all in" or "all out." Mao Tse-tung shrewdly recognized this weakness recently when he reportedly said that "the Americans will lose in Vietnam because they don't have the patience for this type of situation."

Mao must be proven wrong. We must acquire the maturity that goes with global responsibility, and recognize the importance of graduated, flexibility responses to crises situations. Fundamentally our policy must be one designed to encourage moderation and discourage extremism on the part of our opponents, and one that seeks now to start closing the gap between the haves and the have nots of the world. This is the only route to peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MINISH (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. ROSENTHAL), for Monday, June 7, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. CALLAWAY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of the

ple against the establishment of absolute monarchy. However, the mere formation of a counterbalance to a king is enough protection. Therefore, the ancient Athenians, under the guidance of Solon in 496 B.C. made a constitution, the formation of which is described by Aristotle. John Locke, whose works were an inspiration for the Declaration of Independence, wrote in 1690, "Whatever form the commonwealth is under, the ruling power ought to govern by declared and received laws, and not by extemporary dictates and undetermined resolutions," so that "the rulers, too, (be) kept within their due bounds, and not to be tempted by the power they have in their hands to employ it to [their] purposes."

The difficulties of forming a constitutional government were expounded upon by Baron de Montesquieu in 1747 when he wrote "To form a moderate government it is necessary to combine the several powers; to regulate, temper, and set them in motion; to give, as it were a ballast to one, in order to counterpoise the other. This is the masterpiece of legislation; rarely produced by hazard, and seldom attained by prudence."

He clearly recognized the merits of a republican form of government. "Liberty is generally said to reside in republics * * * while democratic states are not in their own nature free." He saw the complete and eternal antithesis of republican and totalitarian governments; since "In republican governments men are all equal; equal they are also in despotic governments; in the former because they have everything; in the latter because they are nothing." Finally, in 1785, only 2 years before the Constitutional Convention, Immanuel Kant wrote "the only rightful constitution is that of a pure republic." Our farseeing forefathers were very cognizant of the words of these great philosophers of the past. They knew as did Aristotle that "That which is common to the greatest number has the least care bestowed upon it" and its corollary, expressed by Locke; "The supreme power cannot take from any man any part of his property without his own consent. For the preservation of property being the end of government, and that for which men into society, it necessarily supposes and requires that the people should have property * * *. Desiring to protect individual freedom and liberty, they realized that "A government may be so constituted, as no man shall be compelled to do things which the law does not oblige him, nor forced to abstain from things which the law permits." Therefore the United States of America was created as a constitutional republic. The creators of the Constitution produced a document uniquely adaptable to the exigencies of our complex changing nation. It cannot become outmoded as some charged.

To suggest this would be to say that the entire range of man's experience from Plato to Aristotle, to Locke and Montesquieu, and to Jefferson and Madison, is not applicable to modern times. It is to arrogate oneself above the wisdom of the combined philosophers of the last 25 centuries. The Constitution, through separation of powers, and a system of checks and balances, protects all citizens against a cumulation of power in one person or group of persons. Edward Gibbon wrote in "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," "The principles of a free constitution are irrevocably lost when the legislative power is dominated by the executive." Also being aware of Montesquieu's dictum warning, "When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, there can be no liberty," the Convention established the Presidential veto, and congressional overriding of this by a two-thirds majority. Provision for impeachment of the President by Congress was also included.

Montesquieu and Gibbon were also worried about judicial excesses. "There is no liberty if the judiciary power be not separated from

the legislative and executive * * * for the judges would then be the legislator." Gibbon believed, "The discretion of the judge is the first engine of tyranny." However, "In republics, the very nature of the constitution requires the judge to follow the letter of the law; otherwise the law might be explained to the prejudice of every citizen, in cases where their honor, property, or life is concerned." To ameliorate this, the delegates provided for the impeachment of the Justices of the Supreme Court, and also for amendments nullifying Supreme Court decisions.

Ranking in importance with other areas of the Constitution is the Bill of Rights. These first 10 amendments provide guarantees of freedom and liberty for all citizens in all spheres of life. They include freedom of speech, religion, and press, the right to bear arms, the right to a jury trial in civil cases. However, the 10th amendment which reserves the powers to the States not delegated the Federal Government, has been practically usurped by clause 18 of section 8, article 1. This, the so-called elastic clause, has been used by the Federal Government to take over many States rights and functions. Moreover, while the fifth amendment is being greatly abused by Communists and fellow travelers who do not wish to answer questions of congressional investigators, organizations of American citizens exercising their right to keep and bear arms are being harassed.

The American people should awake to the gradual disintegration of their freedoms resulting from the concomitant destruction of the Constitution by unconstitutional laws and practices, as well as de facto legislation by the Supreme Court. While telling of Coriolanus, Plutarch wrote, "For it was well and truly said that the first destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who first gave them bounties and largesses." Reiterating this in 1762, Jean Jacques Rousseau prophesied, "Make gifts of money and you will not be long without chains." All Americans know that welfare comes from income tax, but how many know that Rousseau also wrote, "I hold enforced labor to be less opposed to liberty than taxes?"

Apparently the apathy of Americans has sunk to the depth described by Plato when he said, "The greatest ignorance is when a man hates that which he nevertheless thinks to be good and noble, and loves and embraces that which he knows to be unrighteous and evil." America must escape the prophecy of Rousseau: "As soon as any man says of the affairs of the state: What does it matter to me? the state may be given up for lost." Shall it be written in 1984 perhaps that, "Truly there is no great wisdom in knowing, and no great difficulty in telling after the evil has happened; but to have foreseen the remedy at the time would have taken a much wiser head than ours"? However, there is one clear and evident remedy, of which all informed and patriotic Americans are aware. The remedy is a return to the principles of our Republic's Constitution, the greatest safeguard ever devised against tyranny.

Tabulation of Public Opinion Poll; Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the results of a survey of my district,

Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District. Nearly 9,000 people took the time and trouble to answer. And, for the most part, they agree with me: They like the programs of the Johnson administration.

The administration's approach in Vietnam was supported by 2 to 1 over the nearest alternative.

The administration's proposal for gradual elimination of the national origins quota on immigration also was endorsed by a 2 to 1 margin.

And more than half of those expressing an opinion favored either the administration's original medicare bill or its substitute version, passed by the House, providing for hospital, doctor and major medical expenses.

This is good showing by any standards, and it becomes more impressive when you consider the Republican leanings of the Fourth Congressional District, which, when it sent me back to Congress last fall, made me the only Democrat in the 20th century ever to win a second term in the district.

The results are as follows:

I. Vietnam: What approach do you favor for the United States in Vietnam?

1. Expand war into Communist North Vietnam and go all-out to win, 25.3 percent.

2. Military support of South Vietnam, including attacks in North Vietnam, until a satisfactory settlement can be negotiated, 50.1 percent.

3. Restrict efforts to South Vietnam and negotiate best settlement possible, 10.5 percent.

4. Withdraw troops and advisers immediately and let Vietnamese solve their own problems, 6.9 percent.

5. None of the above, 2.4 percent.

Blank, 4.3 percent.

II. Immigration: The administration has proposed gradual elimination of the national origins quota system, and replacing it with a system favoring skilled workers and relatives of people already in the United States. Do you favor:

1. The administration's proposal, 57.4 percent.

2. No limitations on immigration, 4.7 percent.

3. Present system, 21.8 percent.

4. No immigration, 5.2 percent.

5. None of the above, 5.8 percent.

Blank, 5.3 percent.

III. Transportation: The New Haven Railroad as it now stands cannot continue commuter operations much longer. Do you favor:

1. Expanded bus service instead of commuter railroad, 3.4 percent.

2. Letting private group try to provide commuter service, 17.2 percent.

3. A multistate authority with Federal and local assistance running the railroad or contracting commuter service, 62.7 percent.

4. Having the Federal Government pick up deficit and run the railroad, 9 percent.

5. None of the above, 3.5 percent.

Blank, 4.2 percent.

IV. Medical care for elderly: Which of the following approaches to medical care for those over 65 do you favor:

1. Administration proposal, financed by payroll taxes, providing hospital and nursing home care, home health care visits, and outpatient diagnostic services, 27.6 percent.

2. AMA proposal, financed by Federal-State funds and participant contributions to private insurance companies, providing voluntary comprehensive health coverage, 25.5 percent.

3. House Republican leadership proposal, financed by Federal-State funds and participant contributions to national insurance

June 7, 1965

A2916

fund, providing voluntary comprehensive health coverage, 13.3 percent.

4. Combination of administration approach for basic benefits and Republican leadership plan for doctor, drug, and major medical expenses, 19 percent.

5. None of the above, 7.6 percent.

Blank, 7 percent.

V. I have listed below a number of issues of vital public concern. Please "X" the three items you feel deserve highest priority in Congress.

1. Aid to education, 11.9 percent.

2. Narcotics and crime, 14.2 percent.

3. Space research and exploration, 4.3 percent.

4. Taxes and economic growth, 9.8 percent.

5. Reexamination of foreign aid, 16.5 percent.

6. Needs of our senior citizens, 4.5 percent.

7. Reapportionment of State legislatures on population basis, 2.5 percent.

8. Regulation of mail-order purchase of firearms, 3 percent.

9. Reexamination of national defense requirements, 5.7 percent.

10. Training and employment opportunities for youth, 8.8 percent.

11. Water and air pollution control, 9.2 percent.

12. Commuter railroads, 6.1 percent.

Blank, 2.9 percent.

VI. My age is:

1. Under 25, 5.2 percent.

2. 25 to 34, 16.8 percent.

3. 35 to 44, 28.7 percent.

4. 45 to 59, 31.4 percent.

5. Over 59, 16.1 percent.

Blank, 2.1 percent.

VII. I live in:

1. Bridgeport, 14.6 percent.

2. Darien, 7.7 percent.

3. Fairfield, 4.9 percent.

4. Greenwich, 11.9 percent.

5. New Canaan, 4.9 percent.

6. Norwalk, 17 percent.

7. Stamford, 24.2 percent.

8. Weston, 1.6 percent.

9. Westport, 8 percent.

10. Wilton, 3.9 percent.

Blank, 1.6 percent.

VIII. Do you favor your Congressman asking for your views?

1. Yes, 96.6 percent.

2. No, 7 percent.

3. Undecided, 7 percent.

Blank, 2 percent.

IX. How often do you use the New Haven?

1. Regularly, 27.7 percent.

2. Occasionally, 57.1 percent.

3. Never, 12.4 percent.

Blank, 2.8 percent.

The Agricultural Situation in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] is directing our attention to a situation that merits the attention of all Members. The artificially created manpower shortage for which the administration, and in particular Labor Secretary Wirtz, is responsible, has had repercussions throughout the entire country. This situation described by the gentleman from California adversely affects not only producers but consumers throughout the country.

The producers of vegetables in my district are indirectly feeling the adverse results of the administration's indifference to the facts of life as they pertain to farm labor.

For years U.S. citizens whose normal residences are in the Southwest States move up to the Midwest during growing seasons to care and harvest the vegetable crops. A substantial number this year have gone to California where they have failed to meet the real manpower needs. In so doing, a manpower shortage is beginning to develop in midwestern farm regions.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate numerous economic and social problems that will beset us from the redevelopment of the "wetbacks"—illegal entrants from Mexico. In past years I have struggled to aid individuals who have become victimized by legal complications caused by illegal entry into the country. When the bracero program was effectively functioning, the problem of illegal entry vanished.

United States in Vietnam To Stop Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, at this stage in our history a noisy, radical minority of college students are calling for this Nation to abandon its defense commitments across the world and to pull back from the threat of communism. This vocal minority has alarmed the American people, because their irresponsible comments have appeared to drown out the majority of students who are standing by their Nation in its times of danger; many of this majority have already given their lives for freedom in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from a South Dakota college newspaper which expresses the opinion of the responsible majority of our college students. I am proud of the South Dakota Collegian of the South Dakota State University for expressing sentiments which recognize the magnitude of the Communist threat in southeast Asia.

The enclosed editorial "United States in Vietnam To Stop Red China," from the South Dakota Collegian, May 20, 1965, South Dakota State University, follows:

UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM TO STOP RED CHINA

Students and professors on university campuses across the Nation are jumping on the bandwagon in protest of our role in the war in Vietnam. They usually follow the line of thinking that "it's not our war, it's thousands of miles away, and therefore we should get out as soon as possible."

Why is America involved in the Vietnam conflict? Our Federal Government has maintained that we are there because the South Vietnam Government invited us there

to help defend its country from Communist terrorists and invaders. This is true and is, on the surface, a pretty noble reason. But almost anyone who has studied the situation must agree that the most important reason we are there is to help contain the advance of Communist China.

Red China's expansionist policy has only one goal: world domination. Southeast Asia is only the first step. Control of southeast Asia will alleviate Red China's biggest problem, 700 million hungry, crowded people within her borders. China's military efforts have taken away resources badly needed for economic and agricultural development. She has been forced in the past few years to buy millions of bushels of wheat from other countries to feed her people. Thus southeast Asia, a rich rice-producing area, is an important price to the Red Chinese leaders.

Our Government must feel that Vietnam is the logical place to assert our policy of containment. The side effect of helping defend South Vietnam from Communist aggression is used mainly to help qualify our presence here.

Surely those who deplore our role in Vietnam do not think the Red Chinese will go only as far as the shores of South Vietnam and Laos and simply call it quits. This is just the first step in their drive to dominate the world. From there, the Philippine Islands, Malaysia, Australia and Japan are tantalizing targets. After that, the progression is pretty evident.

We know that we will be forced to stop the Communist drive someplace, sometime, if we are to survive as a democracy. The sooner this is done, the better. Red China's new-found nuclear power adds to the urgency of the inevitable task.

Perhaps our action in Vietnam will prevent an even worse future confrontation. Perhaps it will accomplish nothing. Freedom has never come cheap and, looking at it realistically, it is better to stop freedom's greatest threat in already war-torn Vietnam than on the shores of Hawaii.—W.A.

Tribute to Champion McDowell Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, a very significant occasion took place recently when the trustees of the Cornelia Nixon Davis Nursing Home, to be constructed at Wilmington, N.C., honored Mr. Champion McDowell Davis, the principal benefactor of the home.

Mr. Davis is known to many Members of Congress as a former president of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad and director of the National Chamber of Commerce. I commend to our colleagues a splendid article from the Wilmington Morning Star of May 26, 1965, which reflects an outstanding citizen's generous spirit of charity and service to others.

The article follows:

BEQUEST PROVIDED BASE TO CREATE NURSING HOME

WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH.—A \$50,000 bequest made to Champion McDowell Davis by a friend 23 years ago provided the base for creation of the million-dollar-plus Cornelia Nixon Davis Nursing Home, Davis revealed at a testimonial dinner in his honor here Tuesday night.

Despite Mr. Shaw's restrained praise, the facts are evident—"better than in any other technology."

If we are permitted this course of action, we can, I believe, put a nuclear reactor of vastly improved design in a new hull and have that ship sailing on commercial service prior to 1970.

With AEC cooperation, private enterprise is adequate to the task and eager to undertake it. Moreover, such an arrangement is far more in keeping with the American tradition than to vest full responsibility for development in the hands of an agency of the Government.

Unless we are allowed to proceed—unless Government and industry move forwardly, boldly together—then we must reconcile ourselves to the role of a spectator. We can watch while in West Germany they install an American-designed reactor, a *Savannah* improvement, into a new hull. And we can ask ourselves, "Why are we letting them get the jump on us?"

Only One Final Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, as an indication of the widespread support for the President's position on certain foreign policy issues which have been under attack lately, the Lincoln Star has no parallel. I believe that an editorial of June 2 was very indicative of the sympathetic analyses which have been characteristic of this Nation in the last few weeks. I therefore, include it in the Record at this point:

ONLY ONE FINAL DECISION

The unique and often lonely role of the President of the United States was demonstrated by President Johnson at the commencement of his daughter, Luci, and her classmates. Criticism of administration policy is welcome, said the President, but in the end the decisions can be made by only one man.

He said he makes his decisions no matter how "the transient winds of opinion blow." He was referring specifically to foreign policy and the commitment of U.S. men and arms in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. There isn't any question that Johnson knows this commitment is an unpopular one.

There is not an individual in the Nation who wants this Nation to be fighting anywhere. They do not want American servicemen dying on foreign soil. But Johnson also knows that it is not a popularity contest in which he is engaged. He must do what he feels is right, whether it is popular or not. And then he must rest his case on the basis of need, the demand of the times.

He hopes that the American people, too, know the difference between what might be desirable and what is essential. In the President's decision, there is no room for the use of chance, either. He must proceed on the basis of what action holds the greatest promise with the least risk. What might be called long shots are plentiful but not as a part of any final reckoning.

It is a job that demands the kind of bipartisan support our foreign policy has and the understanding that is a part of such support. Criticism, of course, is an other essential part of our national life but it should not completely dominate the scene.

Congress and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial in today's New York Times speaks eloquently for many Americans in calling for more vigorous congressional interest in the Vietnam war. Congress has a responsible role to play in the conduct of our foreign policy. By questioning, as the Times editorial does, the reluctance of Secretary Rusk to employ the full resources of his department and give independent advice, the meager use of the President of nonofficial task forces in the foreign policy field, the overall dependence on military and intelligence agencies, the reasons behind the divorce between the administration and the Nation's intellectuals, as well as the nature of the war and its conduct, Congress can perform a great service to the Republic.

Debate over Vietnam policies undoubtedly will result in publicizing some differences of opinion between Congress and the President which were largely glossed over by recent votes on additional appropriations for Vietnam. The resolution of these differences, however, can only result in a more enlightened and strengthened foreign policy for the United States. Furthermore, although publicizing differences may expose the day-to-day conduct of the war to some tactical disadvantage, the overall advantage to be gained from congressional debate in the conduct of our foreign policy greatly outweighs the tactical risks involved.

Thus, while 28 Congressmen recently requested Chairman MORGAN of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to hold hearings on administration policy in Vietnam, I believe there are many others who agree such hearings would be in our best self-interest.

I accordingly urge your serious consideration of the following New York Times editorial and ask that it be printed at this point in the Record:

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1965]

CONGRESS AND VIETNAM

Signs are growing of congressional interest in ending the leave-it-to-Lyndon era in American foreign policy.

There is Senator FULBRIGHT's new proposal to give the OAS a major voice in channelling American military assistance to Latin America. There is the provision in the new foreign aid bill for a thoroughgoing congressional investigation and for terminating the aid program in its present form in 1967.

There is the trip to Europe, at their own expense, of four House Republicans to investigate the crisis in NATO. And there are the recent criticisms of administration policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, plus his current charge that the United States is neither meeting its aid responsibilities to the underdeveloped countries nor identifying itself with the world revolution underway in those areas.

Factors that go beyond the President's limited experience in foreign affairs and

the extraordinary vacillations in Dominican policy have set off the present questioning at home and abroad. The reluctance of Secretary of State Rusk to employ the full resources of his Department and give independent advice, the meager use made by the President of nonofficial task forces in the foreign policy field, the overdependence on military and intelligence agencies and the divorce between the administration and the Nation's intellectuals—all point to a need for more vigorous congressional interest.

Nowhere is this more vital than on Vietnam, where grave constitutional questions are raised by the official acknowledgement of an increasing combat role for American troops. During the 18 months of the Johnson administration, the number of American troops in Vietnam has been tripled to about 46,500; a further buildup to more than 60,000 appears imminent. American planes have entered into combat both in South and North Vietnam—in the latter case openly attacking a foreign country with no declaration of war. American warships have bombarded the North Vietnamese coast. And there are indications that American ground troops—first employed as advisers in South Vietnam, then deployed to defend American installations and now directly engaged in patrolling action—will soon take on a full combat role as a tactical reserve aiding South Vietnamese units in trouble.

Yet, at no point has there been significant congressional discussion, much less direct authorization of what amounts to a decision to wage war. That is why 28 Democratic Congressmen, on the initiative of Representative ROSENTHAL, of Queens, now have wisely asked the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to hold public hearings on the administration's Vietnam policy.

American casualties in Vietnam, while still relatively minor, already exceed those of the Spanish-American War. The choices open to the President are exceedingly difficult ones; they should not be his alone, either as a matter of sound policy or of constitutional obligation. If he takes it upon himself to make an American war out of the Vietnamese tragedy—without seeking congressional and national consent—he may open the country to divisions even more dangerous than those that developed out of the Korean conflict.

Project Neptune-Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a new and rapidly expanding State university in my district, Florida Atlantic, has recently been selected as the participating university in Project Neptune-Atlantic. The Neptune project is a cooperative venture between the privately owned American merchant marine and the scientific community in furtherance of the national oceanographic program of the United States. Under this program a team of oceanographers will collect oceanographic data while aboard a merchant vessel without interfering with the ship's normal operations.

In participating in this project, Florida Atlantic will use what has come to be known as the "van" concept of data col-

June 7, 1965

lection. Their Department of Ocean Engineering will equip a portable van with scientific instruments. This van will then be transported to New York where it will be loaded upon the SS *Export Champion* and utilized during the ship's normal run to the Mediterranean. Upon return to New York the van will be unloaded and returned to the university where the data collected on the trip will be analyzed and appraised.

I am extremely proud of the part Florida Atlantic will be playing in this cooperative venture. The field of oceanography is so vast and so full of challenges that utilization of our merchant fleet in cooperation with the scientific community will provide the opportunity to release our specialized oceanographic vessels for more sophisticated research tasks. Florida Atlantic is well on the way to becoming one of the Nation's leading institutions for ocean research and ocean engineering.

Tribute to a Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my district is proud to acknowledge the presence of an outstanding American who has attained success, honor, and distinction, not only in one career, but in two. He was a great military leader in World War II where he achieved the rank of vice admiral. Upon retirement from the Navy, he retired to Pensacola where he was promptly placed into service as mayor. His work in that capacity has been outstanding in every respect. Now, he is insisting upon taking another well deserved retirement. He takes with him the very best wishes of every person who has been privileged to know him.

I am glad to propose for reprinting in the Record a tribute to him from the Pensacola News-Journal of May 30, 1965:

TRIBUTE TO A LEADER

Great leadership is much in demand these days.

And Adm. Charles P. Mason, aviation pioneer, military commander, civic worker, and spirited mayor of our growing city, has been a great inspiration for high-quality leadership in Pensacola.

We need more leaders like Mayor Mason.

And we pay tribute to him upon his second retirement from the official duties as mayor of Pensacola. To us, he will always be Mayor Mason, a lifetime honor bestowed upon him by the Florida Legislature following his previous term in city hall.

The admiral epitomizes the brightest of leadership images, fulfilling a task which will long serve as a lofty goal of those who follow him to city hall.

Mayor Mason steps out of his high office at a time when Pensacola needs men of high caliber to inspire us and lead us through a period of municipal and community growth and prosperity.

It is a time of reason, of positive thinking, of reaching out and grasping for more

progress. We welcome the new faces to the city council, men chosen by Pensacolans to carry out the policies and chart a proper course of high purpose through their talents as elected officials. The next few weeks, during a period of change at city hall, should not be a time of indifference but a time of calm, thoughtful reflection and positive direction.

We hope our elected officials will keep alive the leadership demonstrated so admirably by such men as Charles P. Mason. He has always shown the highest character and integrity. And he stepped into the breach of municipal government to contribute great service after a long and honorable career as naval flier, innovator, and wartime commander.

He has led many community endeavors, from all types of civic projects as well as service in Florida civil defense and the establishment of the Pensacola Historical Museum in Old Christ Church at Seville Square. His versatility is indicative of the type of leader so vitally needed in our city.

I live in Pensacola by choice, primarily because I like the people. Mayor Mason said in announcing his first retirement as councilman-mayor in 1953. A council resolution said: "He has brought to the office of mayor his attributes of dignity, distinction, zeal, firmness, and graciousness in such measure that he has given new meaning to the office which shall forever remain as a challenge to his successors and as an example to his fellow citizens * * * (his) leadership has brought about the greatest period of growth and the most outstanding era of expansion and prosperity in the history of the city."

Mayor Mason was a 38-year naval veteran when he retired here in 1946. A native of Pennsylvania, he was graduated from the Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1912. He first came to Pensacola in 1916, training to become naval aviator No. 52 in 1917. He saw service in France during World War I and served on the Armistice Commission in Germany in 1918. The mayor later commanded the first seaplane squadron of the Pacific Fleet.

Mayor Mason married the former Ralphine Fisher in Pensacola in 1917 and returned here in 1921 as superintendent of naval aviation training. He later served on the first aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Langley*, making the first night takeoff and first catapult launching.

He commanded the U.S.S. *Hornet* when the aircraft carrier went down during the Battle of Santa Cruz during World War II in 1942. In 1943, the admiral was elevated to command of all air forces in the Solomon Islands. His many decorations include the Navy Cross, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, and honors from Mexican, Chilean, Peruvian and Brazilian Governments. He has been president of the Association of Early Aviators, or "Bald Eagles."

Returning to Pensacola after his retirement, Mason was named deputy State director of Florida Civil Defense and later headed the Pensacola Historical Society during the time when the organization was developing plans for its museum.

Mason, 74, was first chosen Pensacola mayor in June 1947, then as now not a member of the council. He was reappointed in 1949. In 1951, he ran for and was elected to the council and was renamed mayor, serving both as councilman and mayor until June 1957.

Upon his retirement as mayor, the Florida Legislature designated him honorary Pensacola mayor for life.

The words of a Pensacola Area Chamber of Commerce resolution, paying lasting tribute to Mayor Mason, clearly bring into focus his long dedication and excellent service to his community:

Mayor Mason is "deserving of the highest praise and commendation from the citizens of Pensacola, the metropolitan area and all areas that have come within his sphere of

influence" and further commended him for "devotion, loyalty, unselfishness, industry and fidelity that he has unceasingly given to each and every undertaking of both his public and private life.

We sincerely hope that our newly chosen slate of municipal leaders will continue to draw inspiration from the long service of Charles P. Mason, a real leader whose retirement leaves big shoes to fill.

The Importance of Price to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Paul Grain Terminal Association's Radio Roundup for June 1, looking at the dismal farm price situation, indicates "We ought to take a lesson from what is happening in other nations before it is too late."

Certainly, this clear appraisal of our troubles with the Common Market, and the sharp contrast between Government controlled versus free world agriculture is most helpful in understanding what is at stake. I hope my colleagues will take time to read it, and for that reason, I place it in the Record:

You can't kid the farmer about farm prices. He knows how important they are. And that's true the world around.

The economists talk about efficiency, the scientists about production, the Government people talk about regulation, but the farmer knows that it is the price he gets that counts first and most. Some governments have a hard time learning this, although the farmers tell them in a thousand different ways.

For example, you know what a hassle we're having with the Common Market over in Western Europe. We've been telling those EEC nations that our farmers can produce grain for less so they should import from us instead of growing their own and holding their farm prices up high. We tell them that they should reduce their support prices, divert farm capital (and people) into industry, and buy their farm products from us because we can produce them so much cheaper. However, our European customers don't seem to be much impressed with that argument. They insist upon putting first things first, and they say that fair prices to farmers come first in the European Common Market organization. They're mighty firm on that point.

When you put yourself in their shoes and examine their point of view, they have good reason to be firm about fair farm prices. The West Germans, whose farm prices are tremendously high compared to ours, can peek over the Berlin Wall and see the depressing results of enforced low farm prices. They see East Germany, Hungary, Romania, the Soviet Union, countries that were the breadbasket of Europe before World War II. Today they must import food.

Why? Well, for more than 20 years those Eastern European countries have been suffering under the yoke of enforced low farm prices. The plan apparently was to build industry and bleed agriculture to do it. The whole story of this sad affair is written up in an English-language publication which prints the text of a report by Comrade Brezhnev, First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He openly ad-

the General Services Administration which requested the proposed legislation as a part of its 1965 legislative program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AT ST. MARY COLLEGE, XAVIER, KANS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Memorial Day, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] delivered the address at the commencement exercises of St. Mary College, Xavier, Kans. With the exception of some paragraphs of opening and closing remarks, the text of Senator MANSFIELD's address was printed in the Washington Sunday Star of June 6, 1965.

Because the speech deals with a subject of consuming importance to all of us, because it is discerning, and because, in my judgment, it ought to be read by the largest possible audience, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANSFIELD SEES HOPE FOR PEACE IN NUCLEAR STANDOFF

(NOTE.—Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD spoke at the commencement exercises of St. Mary College in Xavier, Kans., on May 30. For one of the men in positions of real power in Washington, his speeches are few. In this one he gave his own definition of the issues between the Communist world and the Western World, in simple terms, and revealed some of his own philosophy about our role in meeting the most important challenge before mankind today. This is the text, with the omission of a few paragraphs of opening and closing remarks.)

It is of some of these international changes of the past 15 years which I would like to speak today. These are changes which began as trickles just after you were born and now coming into flood as you enter adulthood.

An overriding change since the Korean war has been the emergence of a kind of stalemate between Russia and the United States in terms of destructive nuclear capacity. Nuclear technology in both nations has now reached a point at which no significant military advantage is likely to be gained merely by pushing the accumulation of more destructive power. That is not to say that the Russians are not alert to possible technological breakthroughs or that we

have gone to sleep. The search goes on here and it also goes on there. But a decisive altering of the basic nuclear stalemate is not in sight.

The fact is that both Russia and the United States are already in a position in which each can obliterate at least half the population of the other in a very short time. That is a sobering reality for all those with a share of the responsibility for the many decisions which, in the end, may involve an ultimate decision as to whether or not these instruments are used.

MONUMENT TO J.F.K.

The very magnitude of the nuclear threat which hangs over the earth has had, oddly, a kind of constructive influence on world affairs. It is one of the realities which underlay the Russian withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a couple of years ago. And it was a major factor in the achievement of the nuclear test ban treaty. That treaty, in turn, was a precipitant in bringing about an improvement in the general relations—at least until recently—between the two principal nuclear powers. In that respect, the treaty was a most significant achievement in the drive for a more peaceful world. It stands as an enduring and appropriate monument to John Fitzgerald Kennedy—who would have been 43 yesterday—who refused, with great courage, to be deflected by political considerations, from his determination to achieve it.

The nuclear stalemate between Russia and the United States, then, is, indeed, one of the most significant changes of the past decade and a half. It has produced an international situation with which the principal nations have managed to live in reasonable stability for several years. In its context, the prospect of a Soviet military invasion of Western Europe which, for example, was once regarded as acute, appears to have receded. And by the same token, the military liberation of Eastern Europe which once was loudly trumpeted is no longer pressed from any responsible source as the basis of a sound policy for the Nation.

In short, the overall position of the two great nuclear powers in today's world appears to have become, increasingly, one of live and let live. This trend has emerged largely because the point has sunk home that the alternative is the opposite on such a scale as to drain either the triumph of freedom or the victory of communism of rational meaning. But the picture of a gradual easement in Soviet-United States relations is not complete unless we also take into consideration the effect of recent developments in Vietnam. These developments have not helped the trend which was inaugurated under President Eisenhower, pursued most effectively by President Kennedy, and vastly encouraged and continued by President Johnson.

The changed situation in Russian-United States relations in turn has been paralleled by changes throughout the Soviet bloc. It is obvious that the greater stability in Russian-United States relations has not set well with China but it has generally been welcomed by such Eastern European nations as Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

Communism did not spring full-blown in those Eastern European nations at the close of World War II. Communism was in fact grafted by Soviet power onto several countries with different traditions, even as Stalin shut down on them an iron lid of ideological uniformity. The clothes of Communist conformity, however, were uncomfortable in Eastern Europe and, beneath them, the individual national traditions continued to stir. In recent years, this force for diversity has begun to find fuller expression.

The growing independence in eastern Europe has been encouraged cautiously by recent policies of the United States. This was

a cardinal principle of the foreign policy of President Kennedy, who recognized its value with respect to Poland even when he was a Senator. The conclusion of trade agreements and travel arrangements with eastern European countries which pose no threat to us, as, for example, with Poland and Yugoslavia, has tended to increase their independence from the Soviet Union and provided some inducement for other satellite countries to follow in their footsteps—and that they have been, in fact, doing.

EUROPEAN CHANGES

In this atmosphere of reduced tension in Europe, a difficult and intricate problem remains as the central roadblock to further progress toward a stable peace in that region. That is the problem of a divided Germany. In East Germany, the Soviet Union has continued to maintain a harsh and rigid control over a people who dislike the Communist system intensely. For our part, policy with respect to Germany is, apparently, based on an official assessment of immediate Soviet intentions in Europe which differs considerably from that of our allies in Western Europe. It appears to me that these nations—West Germany, Britain, France, Italy, and others—see the Soviet situation in quite a different perspective—at least insofar as this perspective is reflected in policies. The Europeans, for example, carry on a trade with the Soviet Union which over recent years has run in the billions. What we have done in a most limited way in trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, they have done many, many times over with all of Eastern Europe and, of course, with the Soviet Union itself. Travel within Europe—East and West—is now very extensive and the lines of communication by sea, rail, road, and air between the two parts of the Continent have expanded very markedly. In short, the Europeans generally have been acting with respect to the Soviet bloc as though peace had arrived in Europe. We have not, in policy, shared that optimism.

If there were a fusion of views as to precisely what the situation is, it is conceivable that, with it, there might also come a parallel recognition that proposals aimed at ending the armed confrontation in Germany and moving toward reunification are worth pursuing most intensely. A number of ideas have been advanced over the years which could serve as a beginning, but they have not as yet led to significant changes in policy.

The shift in Europe over the past few years is not unique. It is paralleled, for example, by significant changes which involve the underdeveloped countries. The political face of Africa has changed and over most of that continent control is now exercised by African leaders rather than by Europeans. Many new nations have been added to the ranks of the intensely independent and underdeveloped states. But from the point of view of the nuclear powers, almost all such states are, now, of less importance as strategic prizes, to be wooed for their value as bases in the event of a total war. We ourselves have recognized this change to a considerable degree. We have, for example, abandoned a number of advanced airbases in these areas in the light of the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile and Polaris-carrying nuclear submarines. Similarly, the control of alien territory to insure access to strategic military raw materials which was once an absolutely vital consideration for all great powers may no longer carry quite so much weight.

RESISTING AGGRESSION

This change in attitudes involving the underdeveloped nations applies in southeast Asia. President Johnson has said that there is no need for a forward base in that part of the world. Our fundamental power in the Pacific is air and sea power. This power, supreme throughout the Pacific, is sufficient

June 7, 1965

protect American security from any direct military threat from that part of the world for some years to come.

We also have in Vietnam, as elsewhere in southeast Asia, a shared interest with all free nations in resisting aggression. We can and will remain prepared to assist in stopping overt attempts to overrun peoples by force. But beyond this goal of preventing aggression in order to promote peace and freedom under the rule of law in the world, our direct national interests in southeast Asia are not nearly as great, for example, as those which we have with respect to Latin America.

For these reasons, as well as a basic aversion to war itself, the President has made it clear that we are willing to enter into unconditional discussions in an effort to find an honorable settlement in Vietnam and a more stable situation throughout southeast Asia. But if there is ever to be an honorable settlement, there has to be a beginning. There has to be a confrontation across the tables of peace. If such a meeting is to have any prospect of a successful outcome, there is also a parallel and simultaneous need for an interim cease-fire and standoff—both north and south. Unless the sounds of conflict are, first, stilled on all sides, the words of peace will not be heard on any side.

COMMON EFFORT NEEDED

I am at a loss to understand how those elsewhere—in Peking, for example—expect to be taken seriously in professing to hold paramount the interests of the people of Vietnam and a restoration of peace when, at the same time, they insist upon interpreting the President's words as meaning something other than unconditional discussion. It would be in our own best interests no less than in the best interests of the underdeveloped countries of southeast Asia were the latter able to concentrate on their own inner national needs and growth. That was clearly the President's hope when he offered to join with the Soviet Union and other nations in a common effort for the development of southeast Asia.

A common effort of this kind is clearly, too, the best way to help most of the underdeveloped nations, wherever they may be in the world, to remain free of outside domination and influence and to give indigenous institutions of freedom an opportunity to take root. Indeed, in the long run, it may be just about the only way to help them.

We are not likely to insure freedom within these nations by taking it upon ourselves either to overwhelm them with unilateral help or by turning our backs on their genuine needs for help. The one is the road to an isolated internationalism for this Nation. The other is the road to a national isolation for this Nation. And neither road is likely to lead to the safeguarding of the basic interests of this Nation. In short, the great need is for a discrete and discerning cooperation with other nations in dealing with underdeveloped nations.

SEARCH FOR PEACE

This principle has relevance for the current crisis in the Dominican Republic which, after decades of a cruel dictatorship, is still a most underdeveloped nation. The President faced a critical situation—an emergency—there some weeks ago. He acted to meet it on humanitarian grounds and he met it well. And he is acting now to bring fully into play, the concept of cooperation with others in that situation. As a member of the Organization of American States, our military and diplomatic resources in the Dominican Republic are being used more and more in support of the Organization. For the problem in the island is not one of unique responsibility for the United States. It is one which must engage primarily the Dominican people and their leaders and, to the extent that it is necessary, the entire Western Hemisphere.

With the development of an inter-American military force, the heavy initial commitment of American forces on the island has already been reduced. And it is to be hoped, moreover, that this reduction will be rapidly accelerated if stability can be restored under the guidance of the OAS. I would hope, too, that the inter-American force which would remain could play two roles—that is, to support the efforts of the OAS and also to help in the reconstruction of Santo Domingo which has been seriously damaged in the struggle. It would also be desirable if other American states could develop a peace corps and send contingents to join the young men and women of this Nation who are already undertaking in the Dominican Republic many works of useful and peaceful construction.

To Americans, even to college students like you, the affairs of nations outside our borders may seem remote and unimportant at times, especially on a day like today. But I need not remind you—on Memorial Day—that events whose origins lay thousands of miles from our shores have reached into this Nation in the past and called us to sacrifice. As Americans, as inhabitants of the only world we have, I ask you to exercise the increasing responsibility which will be yours in the years ahead to see that no stone lies unturned, and that no outdated myth or ancient hatred lies unexamined, and that no opportunity is neglected in the slow painstaking search for a lasting peace.

And I ask you, too, to give your prayers to the President of the United States. His is the enormous burden in these matters. His is the paramount responsibility. For him, there is no rest from the incessant pressure of the problems of the Nation. For him, there is a plethora of advice and criticism which is easily enough extended. But upon him, in the end, falls the weight of grave decision as he seeks to follow the slender path to that stable peace which is the world's great need.

AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM BY COUNTRIES OTHER THAN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the United States continues with the unpleasant but necessary task of helping the people of southeast Asia to resist the aggressions of communism. You and I and the rest of the American people read each day about the maneuvers of the South Vietnamese and our own troops; the areas being defended; and the growing casualty toll.

I have heard public expressions of doubt, even on the floor of the Senate, about the desirability of our action, expressions which imply, at least, that we are responsible for this problem. What blindness. Every action taken by this Nation has been geared to offset aggression in one form or another started by the Communists in each instance. Whether we speak of Berlin, Cuba, Santo Domingo, Indonesia, South Vietnam, or the Congo, all the problems have been created by the clearly spoken and reiterated words of the Communists that they intend to rule the world.

Are we alone in recognizing these problems? Are we so different in seeing problems in South Vietnam that other countries back away from supporting our position? Exactly the opposite is true. Today, 38 nations are giving or have agreed to give aid in one form or another to the people of South Vietnam, who are resisting naked Communist aggression.

To me, this is highly interesting. I have compiled a list of the countries which are proceeding to give aid to South Vietnam at present, together with a statement of what aid is being provided—at least, those things that are being done which are not under security classification.

These countries—and I shall not read everything they are doing, but I wish to name the countries—include Australia, Nationalist China, Japan, South Korea, Laos, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, India, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France—even France has provided some aid—Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Holland, Spain, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, and Guatemala.

In addition, it ought to be noted that only 10 nations were assisting us in South Vietnam prior to July 16, 1964, less than a year ago. The other 28 nations have begun their assistance since that time.

In addition to the countries I have named, several other Central American countries, including Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador, have been trying to muster a medical team to send to South Vietnam for assistance.

It seems to me that such assistance is of extreme importance, because nowhere have I seen any kind of rundown in the news media or elsewhere which would indicate the degree of support which is being given to the free South Vietnamese people in their efforts to resist Communist aggression by North Vietnam and Red China. Therefore, I am happy to present this information for the benefit of all Senators and for the country as a whole, in the hope that more recognition may be given of the assistance which other countries have been and are giving to South Vietnam and to the United States in the interest of preserving the freedom of people, not only in southeast Asia, but in the rest of the world, as well, against Communist aggression.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FOREIGN COUNTRIES HAVING PROVIDED AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES

Australia: Infantry battalion on the way; 100 combat advisers there; air force unit with planes in Vietnam; 8-man surgical party; civil engineers; training 110 Vietnamese in Australia. Goods: 1 million textbooks in Vietnamese language for schools; windmills; hand tools; radio sets; building broadcasting station in Vietnam.

Nationalist China: 80-man agricultural team; 16-man psychological warfare team; 8-man electrical power mission; 10-man surgical team; training 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. Goods: 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses; agricultural tools, seeds, and fertilizers; math textbooks; electrical power stations.

Japan: \$55 million in economic assistance, mainly through reparations; 90 Japanese personnel in Vietnam—70 of which are working on the construction of a power dam (Japanese are not allowed to send military forces; these are civilians); 6-man surgical

large amount of medical goods; 20,000 radios; 25 ambulances; electrical transmission lines.

Korea: 130-man mobile army surgical hospital; 10 military instructors in Vietnam teaching karate and hand-to-hand combat; 2,200-man task force—mainly engineering corps with security troops.

Laos: 1 million kip (Laotian currency) for refugees.

Malaysia: Although they can't provide military men, the Malaysians have established schools for training in Communist counterinsurgency using the experience they have gained from their combat with Communist infiltration. Have trained some 2,000 Vietnamese since 1962. They have also sent some armed vehicles to help.

New Zealand: Surgical team; 25-man corps of engineers rebuilding buildings; artillery battery, will be sent (Andac); have built science building at the University of Saigon estimated at \$200,000.

Philippines: 70 military personnel; civilian and military medical teams; President of Philippines has asked for 2,000 additional men to go to Vietnam—this motion has passed the House and is now in the Senate.

Thailand: Military air detachment in Vietnam (other military information is classified); cement; roofing material.

Greece: Medical supplies.

Turkey: Medical supplies; offers of cement.

Iran: 1,000 tons POL products.

Israel: Pharmaceutical supplies; offers for training in Israel.

India: Money for flood relief; plans for other assistance in the economic field (being part of the ICC hinders Indian help in any further manner).

Austria: Medicines, supplies, blankets, tents.

Belgium: Medicines.

Canada: \$2.5 million of assistance; medical professor at the University of Saigon; training over 130 Vietnamese in Canada in long-term studies such as engineering, etc.; \$500,000 worth of aluminum warehouses.

Denmark: Planning to train Vietnamese nurses; have provided assistance for refugees.

France: Since 1956 have provided \$100 million in assistance; 500 people working in Vietnam—medical, educational, cultural missions.

Germany: \$20 million in assistance; can't send troops; have provided physicians for medical school, technicians, and ambulances.

Ireland: Financial support in the amount of 1,000 pounds.

Italy: 9-man surgical team.

Luxembourg: Is planning to help but not sure how.

Holland: Antibiotics; agreed to send medical team.

Spain: Medicines, equipment, and blankets.

Switzerland: 10 microscopes.

United Kingdom: Personnel in Vietnam—advisory and professors; couple million dollars worth of equipment.

Argentina: 2 military observers—study possible assistance.

Brazil: Coffee, medical supplies.

Ecuador: Medicines.

Guatemala: Typhoid para typhoid serum.

Several other Central American countries (including Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador and others) have been trying to muster a medical team.

Prior to July 16, 1964, only 10 nations were assisting the war in South Vietnam including the United States. All others listed above have entered since then.

TRAVEL IS NO LONGER A HANDICAP FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is remarkable how very much is being done

in recent years to assist the handicapped in leading a normal, useful life.

Not so long ago travel was a difficult and harassing business for a man in a wheelchair. Now, however, the airlines have agreed on a standardized policy for serving the handicapped. No longer are they refused passage at the airport because of the whim of a ticket taker.

Increasingly, hotel and motel keepers are installing the facilities—level entrances, wide doorways—required by the handicapped. Soon, perhaps, the depressing experience of being denied accommodations because of physical barriers will be a thing of the past.

Many civic leaders have given their time and effort to improving the lot of the handicapped. The leadership to the movement and the confidence in its success, however, have come from one source: The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped under the chairmanship of the late Gen. Melvin Mass and Harold Russell.

Once again the Committee has come up with a new imaginative and useful program. Working in conjunction with the nationwide Hertz rent-a-car system, there are now hand-controlled cars available for the use of the handicapped in nine of our Nation's largest cities. The service will be a boon to all traveling handicapped and the Hertz Co. is to be congratulated on its interest and cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement from the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENTAL CARS WITH HAND CONTROLS NOW AVAILABLE TO HANDICAPPED TRAVELERS

Hertz Rent A Car, in cooperation with the President's Committee, now makes cars equipped with hand controls available to handicapped persons who must travel in connection with their business or for pleasure. This service is available at the present time in the following cities:

New York, N.Y. (212) MU 8-7744; Detroit, Mich. (313) WO 2-3290; Chicago, Ill. (312) DE 7-7272; Washington, D.C. (202) 296-6500; Los Angeles, Calif. (213) MA 6-4841; San Francisco, Calif. (415) PR 1-2200; Miami, Fla. (305) FR 7-4601; Dallas, Tex. (214) RI 1-4611; Boston, Mass. (617) HU 2-9100.

There will be no additional charge for hand control equipment. Standard rental rates will apply. The cars must be returned to one of the above cities. At least 2 days advance notice is requested so that the equipment may be installed and tested prior to the rental. A valid driver's license must be presented at the time of rental.

To place a reservation, handicapped travelers can call collect, person to person, to the city in which he wishes to rent a car, and ask to speak to "the man in charge of hand controls." To avoid a wait when picking up the car, the traveler should tell the hand control man by telephone whether he has a Hertz or other nationally recognized credit card. If he has none, he may state his place of employment, resident address, and a personal reference.

Renters without a nationally recognized charge card will be asked to leave a cash deposit, based on the length of rental and estimate of anticipated mileage. The de-

posit will be accepted in cash or traveler's checks, and will be deducted from the total rental charges, with a cash refund or balance due payable at the rental's completion.

TECHNOLOGICAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD for the convenient reference of other Senators a penetrating and important article by Claude Witze, senior editor of Air Force and Space Digest. The article appeared in the May edition of this professional journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR ANSWER TO FUTURE THREATS: ACTION OR REACTION?

(By Claude Witze)

There is no denying that America, and Americans, have learned a lot from the cold war. Most of the lessons were taken the hard way. We have been amazed by many things, ranging from the Communists' speedy development of thermonuclear weapons to Sputnik and to the swamp war being waged against freedom in South Vietnam.

It seems a bit incredible, for example, that the Wright brothers came out of Dayton, Ohio, more than 60 years ago and that U.S. airpower has dominated world aviation, yet the Russians were first into space. This was because we willed it so. Sputnik could have been ours; we were warned that the Russians were moving into space, and we did less than we could have done.

This kind of technological conservatism has been with us for a long time. The Wright brothers contended with it. In the years immediately after Kitty Hawk, the boys from the bicycle shop strove to interest their own Government in the airplane. The skepticism was almost overwhelming. It was not until after the British, Germans, and the French displayed serious curiosity that the Signal Corps ordered the first military aircraft. Octave Chanute speculated that a European country would have bought the rights before we got around to it, except for the possibility that the Wrights could be kept "dangling in the expectation that some of your competitors will discover the secret and they can get your invention cheaper."

In this case, the assessment of a technological capability was more important to the United States than the capability itself. If the Wright brothers had said they knew how to build a controllable airplane but couldn't convince anyone they could, there would have been no sale. History would have been different, but the possibility of that having happened is remote because someone in Europe would have believed them, even if their countrymen had refused to.

The quality of judgment exercised in evaluating information is critical. It was sad on the eve of Pearl Harbor, terrible during the events leading to the Korean war, faulty in its estimate of the Soviet nuclear timetable. In South Vietnam, where coups take place more frequently than a CIA agent gets his hair cut, somebody is consistently wrong.

Here is the place to introduce a disturbing axiom:

"The most dangerous development at the decisionmaking level of any government is overcentralization of the assessment of technological, military, and political intelligence."

At stake are the paths to be taken in military strategy and the efforts made to face up to technological and other threats.

These paths and efforts are always determined by those who may evaluate intelligence against the background of their own

prejudices, opinions, and ambitions. With a system of checks and balances, pitting one prejudice against another, there is at least hope for objectivity in the final assessment. But with centralized control of intelligence, the men in power may accept or reject intelligence information according to whether it confirms or refutes opinions already held. Let us examine a recent example.

Not long ago, at a public luncheon in Washington, a high Defense Department official scoffed at reports that a new source of energy is being explored and that it might have an application in weaponry. The project, it was emphasized, is only conceptual. The speaker was asked what his opinion would be if we were offered sound intelligence information indicating that the Russians were making spectacular progress toward an operational capability with this new energy source. His answer, in substance, was that he would not believe the intelligence. Within days, the same subject was brought up at a hearing before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. A witness from the Brookhaven National Laboratory testified that his organization has started basic research looking for the key to this new source of energy. If the secret can be unlocked, the hydrogen bomb will be overshadowed.

The important point is that one Pentagon official, who doubtless approves of the Brookhaven effort, apparently would not consider the applicability of this concept to weaponry, even if he were told the potential enemy had a headstart.

It is currently fashionable to cite the steady increase in Federal funds for research and development, and certainly we are accumulating scientific knowledge at a record rate. But the major problem of the next decade will be the application of that knowledge to translate it into working systems for military missions. If we don't want to believe there is a threat, the working systems will never show up in the arsenal of the free world.

Another aspect, brought to mind by Brookhaven's search for a new energy source, is the concern over the proliferation of thermonuclear weapons. The Chinese have shaken us for what is only the first time. France has a program and so does Great Britain. There is talk of the possibility in a long list of "nth powers," from Sweden to Egypt. The full truth is that technology is in a constant surge against any and all of man's efforts to curb the spread of thermonuclear weapons. If it were possible to find a way for nations to stop building and storing bombs and missiles of this type, the Brookhavens of the world still would seek new sources of greater energy. It is their scientific mission to press for technological advances.

Edward Teller, fixing his sights on the part of the spectrum in which his expertise cannot be questioned, has said that nuclear explosives "are being developed with great speed and in an unpredictable manner." And he adds, "technical surprises are an almost yearly occurrence in this rapidly advancing field."

The debate on the nuclear test ban treaty is over, and it will not be reargued here. The treaty aside, it remains that Dr. Teller is but a voice. There are more influential men, some of whom believe military technology is on a plateau and should be kept there. They look for no surprises in the area of weaponry. It is a concept expressed recently in print by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner and Dr. Herbert F. York. They hold that improved weaponry escalates international tension and makes war more likely. It would appear the only surprise they are willing to face is from another country—not necessarily Russia—when it succeeds in overturning the power advantages now claimed by the United States.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, recently retired USAF Chief of Staff, has avoided mentioning

names, but he has replied to the Wiesner-York school.

"Some of the more conservative scientific voices," is the way he identified them in a recent Washington speech. And he said, "They see little possibility in the immediate future for new breakthroughs of major proportions in weapons technology, and they suggest that the scientific community needs a short breathing spell in which to search out the limits of military potential in the discoveries they have already made."

Then the general spotted another and more psychological argument for a conservative approach to new weaponry. This is the one that says, "New U.S. weapons will automatically trigger the U.S.S.R. to undertake still more costly programs for countering our weapons, and we, in turn, would then have to try to offset these developments, and so on up the never-ending spiral."

General LeMay did not throw any bricks, he declared that those who argue along this line "advocate that the United States should try to establish a condition of military stability between the two great powers, and that from this condition of balance we might be able to steadily and mutually lower ourselves to more peaceful plateaus. This school, therefore, classifies all new weapon systems as destabilizing, and it urges that we hold off investing in radical new systems."

What the general really is warning us against is the acceptance of this philosophy, because it entails a bigger risk than its proponents realize. The basic idea that the contribution of technology to future military systems will be small is in error. During the LeMay career, as in that of captains and lieutenants many years his junior, other prophets have been wrong. And the optimists have not been wrong as often as have the conservatives.

The classic example is Dr. Vannevar Bush's statement that the ICBM was technologically impossible. There are others. Take the debate over the H-bomb. President Harry Truman gave the project a green light, but the decision was a marginal one. What would the situation be today if we had refrained from this effort because of any single argument or combination of arguments? It is enough to say that progress on the ICBM and on the H-bomb exceeded expectations; and because it did, the peace has been preserved. There are many who feel that the climate in 1965 is disturbingly like the climate when the ICBM and H-bomb decisions were made, reluctantly.

There is no intention here to imply that U.S. policy is being made by men with blind spots about technological progress behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Nor are we disarming unilaterally in the belief that this is the way to prevent war. It is essential to recognize, however, that these philosophies exist, that they are widely promulgated, and that they affect the decisionmaking process.

This was brought home to the U.S. Congress a couple of months ago during the debate on authorization and funding for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. There was nothing unusual about the fact that ACDA had both friends and foes on the floor of the House and Senate, or that both sides, in the heat of the argument, resorted to some alarmism.

In the course of this discussion, which went on for several days, an interesting development was the introduction into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Senate proceedings, Mar. 10, 1965) of the text of a study called "Information and Strategic Stability," by Bruce Russett, a political scientist from Yale University. Professor Russett took this assignment from the Institute for Defense Analyses, which had a contract sponsored jointly by the ACDA, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Naval Ordnance Test Station. ACDA's share was \$10,000.

The Russett paper was part of a larger report. Counsel for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said that "no specific arms control or reduction proposal has resulted from suggestions contained in the study, although it provided some useful information. As with any study in this field, only those ideas which are clearly in the best interests of our national security will be selected as a basis of formulating U.S. arms-control policy."

Nevertheless, the point was made in the Senate debate that the ACDA had been advised, in the words of Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas, "to bury our head in the sand and ignore what our enemies are doing." More precisely, the Russett report suggests that complete and accurate information—intelligence is another name for it—about a potential enemy's capabilities will not prevent an arms race. It suggests, further, that too much intelligence can fertilize competition.

"If the weaker side is to be satisfied with inferiority," the report says, "it must have some assurance that conflict is improbable."

Later there is a discussion of how this can be done. One idea of Professor Russett is that "it might be desirable, for instance, to reassure the Soviets that no Polaris submarines were within firing range of the U.S.S.R.; and yet we could not afford to pinpoint the location of all of them. One proposed solution is for the Soviets to be able to demand that a few submarines, of their choosing, surface and make their positions known." Presumably this would convince the Russians we were not preparing for an attack, and, by calming their nuclear jitters, might prevent a preemptive attack by them on us.

More germane to this discussion of technological intelligence and how it is used is the Russett suggestion that this information could go through automatic data-processing equipment. The input would be from sensors, presumably in satellites. The machine would be programed so that it give out only sparse information, filtering out "sensitive" material that might provoke one side or the other to start a war.

Other ideas proposed include the use of observation systems with limited capability or automatic measures for delaying the transmission of information. Of the latter, "One example is building observation satellites which record images on film that must be recovered and processed before the information becomes available. This would provide no data, for instance, on the current location of mobile missiles, as would a satellite equipped with television."

Then there is a proposal that transmission of information be stopped entirely during a crisis, and another giving the observed nation a power to veto what information is transmitted.

While Senate critics centered their fire on the fact that the Arms Control Agency was spending public money to get this kind of advice, unaccepted even by the Agency, the point to be made here is that the philosophy behind it has some prevalence.

This becomes vitally important if an evaluator of intelligence should adhere to such a philosophy, taking the attitude that nobody should "bother me with facts, it's evidence I'm looking for." This danger is discussed at length in "The Strategy of Subversion," by Paul W. Blackstock (Quadrangle Books, 1964). Professor Blackstock says that Allen Dulles, former head of the Central Intelligence Agency, recognized that "prejudice is the most serious occupational hazard we have in intelligence work." Then he points out that CIA itself allowed such a factor to distort its estimates before the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion in 1962.

"From the point of view of management and control," the Blackstock text says, "there